

NEW-YORK DAILY TRIBUNE, SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 14, 1863.

the Brazilian Government was of opinion, that no disrepect had been shown to the English Navy, and that it was therefore unable to give any satisfaction.

In reply to this note, Mr. Christie ordered a declaration to be posted at the doors of the British Consulate, to the effect that the Brazilian Government having refused to give satisfaction to Great Britain, the Admiral, Warren, would be immediately instructed to retaliate by seizing Brazilian property. This order was promptly executed; several British vessels were dispatched to the mouth of the harbor of Rio de Janeiro, and a number of Brazilian vessels seized.

These proceedings, of course, called forth an immense excitement. The entire population, with boundless enthusiasm, applauded the refusal of the Ministry to comply with the demands of the British Minister. The indignation manifested against England was intense and caused the apprehension of a popular outbreak against British residents. The Emperor himself, and several of the Cabinet Ministers, found it necessary to address the people, to urge them to remain quiet, and to trust to the Government the vindication of the national honor.

New negotiations which took place between the English Minister and the Brazilian Government led at length to an agreement, according to which the Brazilian Government paid under protest the sum demanded, the vessels seized were returned to their owners, and the final settlement of the question was referred in the first case to the Brazilian Minister in London and the English Government, and in the second to the arbitration of the King of Belgium.

The accounts of the Brazilian papers clearly indicate that the conduct of the British Minister has aroused in the entire population feelings of the utmost excitement and indignation against England, which years may not be able to efface. In Brazil as well as in every other country of South and Central America the desire for a closer union between the Governments of America for the purpose of warding off the encroachments of Europe, is spreading with amazing rapidity.

THE INSURRECTION IN POLAND.

Unhappy Poland is once more in arms against its oppressors. The first intimation of it—probably little heeded by American readers—was given a few days ago in the telegraphic news summary of the Europa, which simply stated that insurrectionary movements were breaking out in Poland. Similar reports have often reached us before, and, on that very account, have attracted but little attention. But, this time it proves to be a wide-spread and well-conducted attempt of the entire nation, as far as it is subject to Russian rule, and, perhaps still further, to recover its national independence.

The accounts which have thus far reached us, represent the matter as very serious. Sanguinary conflicts with the Russian soldiers have taken place in a number of places. A number of Russians have been killed, among them one colonel, and a Russian general has been wounded. The communication between Warsaw and St. Petersburg has been interrupted. The official paper of St. Petersburg charges the National party of Poland, with having meditated a second massacre of St. Bartholomew throughout the kingdom, as not only in Warsaw, but in all the provincial towns, the detachments of the Russian troops were simultaneously attacked.

One thing is certain. A very large portion of the Polish people must have been in the secret of conspiracy. An old revolutionary, well known from the revolutions of 1848—Gen. Mieroslawski—is at the head of the movement. The insurgents, moreover, are undoubtedly expecting succor from the Poles in Galicia and the Prussian Province of Posen. It is even highly probable that an understanding existed with the revolutionary party of Russia, of which Alexander Herzen, in London, is the leader. Only such a hope could give to even the boldest revolutionary the courage to brave the rigor of the Russian law.

Great and universal as the sympathy of the civilized world with the wrongs inflicted upon unhappy Poland is, the recent insurrection will be almost unanimously regretted. Under the actual circumstances there is little, if any, hope of success. Had peace been maintained it is certain that the Polish nation would have made immense progress, not only in material prosperity, but also toward the recovery of its independence. The Austrian province of Galicia has already a Polish Provisional Diet, which might have become an important center for the political aspirations of the entire nation. All Europe has so far advanced in civilization that the extirpation of nationalities, especially if they are so powerful as the Poles, is now counted among the impossibilities. Poland, of whose existence as a nation even the noble Kosciusko despaired, had become sure of a resurrection. This new outbreak, we greatly fear, will postpone the realization of the ardent national wish.

CONNOLLY.

At last, a Police Captain has taken issue with one of the men whom the spurious suffrage of the rum-seller, the gambler, and other and better people have elected to the Bench in this city. Mr. Justice Connolly is sharply arraigned by Capt. Petty of the Fifth-Precinct in this manner:

There appears to be a studied determination on the part of Mr. Justice Connolly to intimidate the officers of this precinct from performing their duties on Sunday. In every case in which officers have been charged with assault and battery, or other crimes, the complaints have been made by rum-sellers who have been arrayed for violating the exchequer laws, and especially the provision against publicly keeping or disposing of liquors on Sunday.

Gov. Curtis on Arbitrary Arrests.

We have received Gov. Curtis's special message to the Pennsylvania Legislature on the subject of military arrests by the General Government. He recites the circumstances which led to them, and says that the State Executive has no authority to interfere. Citizens of Pennsylvania are also citizens of the United States, and subject to the authority of the latter. Their remedy for wrongs, if any are suffered, should be supplied by the Judiciary. Executive action would be at this crisis dangerous and revolutionary. If I hoped there would be no further occasion for public trials, we would be relieved of the burden of the law.

and deters the timid officer from performing his duty as he should do.

These are stinging words, and would make even men writh; but we presume the doughty captain is ready to justify to the letter. Without specifying this or that Justice, we may say with absolute truth that the criminal bench of this city has been so managed for the last two or three years as to be constantly open to the suspicion of favoring law-breakers. The fact need not be disguised that the bench has never supported the police; and the consequence is that, very naturally, the police are disengaged. They say, "What is the use? We catch a rogue in the net; we take him to the Court. No matter how clear the case may be, the magistrate discharges him without even a rebuke, and as likely as not gives the officer a lecture for daring to execute the law." So the whole course of summary justice in petty offenses has been checked, offenders brazenly flaunt their judicial licenses in our faces, mock at the laws, and browbeat any honest citizen who dares to reprehend their conduct. The idea of a Justice directing a prisoner to make a charge, of a Justice coming up from his stool (coming down from such a bench is impossible) to vent his malice in the character of an amateur District-Attorney is about as cool as it would be to open court in a Broadway omnibus, and discharge a prisoner then and there in custody. But nature hath framed strange fellows in her time, and one of these is Mr. Justice Michael Connolly.

SLAVERY IN THE SPANISH COLONIES.

Even Spain, now the only power of Europe which still gives its sanction to Slavery, is beginning to yield to the powerful current of public opinion which demands the abolition of that relic of barbarism. The Correspondencia of Madrid of the 18th ult. states that in pursuance of a royal decree all slaves who may accompany their masters from Cuba to Spain, or any country where Slavery does not exist, shall henceforth be considered free. We hail this decree as a favorable omen for the result of the exertions now being made in Cuba, as well as in Spain, to provide by legislation for the abolition of Slavery in Cuba. It is confidently expected that the Spanish Government will not resist much longer the urgent representations which are made to it from all parts of the Christian world. Abolition of Slavery in Cuba will clear all Europe from complicity with that evil, and leave the United States and Brazil the only countries which protect it.

The Commercial Advertiser thus cautiously comments on Gov. Seward's letter with reference to M. Mercier's visit to Richmond:

"The letter raises a question of veracity between the Secretary of State and the French Minister, though it is possible that remarks made by Mr. Seward may have been mistakes by M. Mercier for distinct expressions which the Secretary desired should be communicated to the gentleman whom 'the South might think fit to send' to the Senate. Mr. Seward also declares that since the 5th of March, 1861, neither this Government nor the Secretary of State has had communication direct or indirect, formal or informal, with the insurgents, their leaders and abettors. This is surprising, as we had long ago the positive statements of Judge Campbell in regard to his mediation between the Secretary of State and the Rebel Commissioners. Judge Campbell's statement has never been denied before, and upon it the Rebels have founded charges of bad faith against Mr. Seward and the President. They have even gone so far as to say that the attack on Sumter by the 'perfidy of the Washington government' is proof that the letter of Mr. Seward was not sincere."

—

The Commercial Advertiser thus cautiously comments on Gov. Seward's letter with reference to M. Mercier's visit to Richmond:

"The letter raises a question of veracity between the Secretary of State and the French Minister, though it is possible that remarks made by Mr. Seward may have been mistakes by M. Mercier for distinct expressions which the Secretary desired should be communicated to the gentleman whom 'the South might think fit to send' to the Senate. Mr. Seward also declares that since the 5th of March, 1861, neither this Government nor the Secretary of State has had communication direct or indirect, formal or informal, with the insurgents, their leaders and abettors. This is surprising, as we had long ago the positive statements of Judge Campbell in regard to his mediation between the Secretary of State and the Rebel Commissioners. Judge Campbell's statement has never been denied before, and upon it the Rebels have founded charges of bad faith against Mr. Seward and the President. They have even gone so far as to say that the attack on Sumter by the 'perfidy of the Washington government' is proof that the letter of Mr. Seward was not sincere."

—

We respectfully suggest that both our Government and the French may well stop printing "Yellow Books," or extensive annual collections of their Diplomatic Correspondence. Though spicy reading in spots, they are apt to be carelessly edited, and to contain whole magazines of sleeping mischief. With us, the fashion is recent, and we trust it is soon to pass away.

SEWARD AND MERCIER.

From an Occasional Correspondent.

WASHINGTON, Feb. 12, 1863.

The apparent conflict between the statements of Mr. Seward and M. Mercier has naturally excited considerable attention, especially among the members of the diplomatic corps.

That part of the answer of Mr. Seward, which seems to question the veracity of the French Envoy, I receive from a gentleman connected with the State Department an explanation which indicates that Mr. Seward did not intend to contradict M. Mercier's statements. Here is the explanation:

A perusal of that letter will convince you that M. Mercier's proposal to go to Richmond was not produced, as the Senate says, by Mr. Seward's suggestions, but originated entirely with M. Mercier himself. "I regret very much," says the Ambassador of France to the Secretary of State, "to be unable to go myself to Richmond to ascertain the state of affairs thither." The initiative of that trip, as it is related by M. Mercier himself, wholly belongs to him, and Mr. Seward had no part whatever in it. The Secretary then states the truth when he says, in his reply to the Senate, that no suggestions were even made to M. Mercier calculated to induce him to undertake a mission to Richmond.

As to the second part of Mr. Seward's letter, in which he says that M. Mercier was not authorized by the Government of the United States to make representations of any kind to the Rebels, or to hold any communication with them, it is an accurate as the first. True, Mr. Seward may have told M. Mercier all that the latter reported of his conversation with him to the French Government, and perhaps more, but as M. Mercier is a foreigner and an officer of a foreign power, it is obvious that Mr. Seward would not intrust him with any official function. M. Mercier so understood it, and his communications with the Rebels in behalf of Mr. Seward, supposing that such communications ever took place were surely of a private character. They could not commit in the least this Government, because they had not the collective assent of the Cabinet, and were simply the expression of the personal wishes of Mr. Seward as an individual, and not of Mr. Seward as Secretary of State.

—

The following are the leading items of intelligence to hand by her:

The Tao-tung of Shanghai had resigned his seals of office, and proceeded to Nanking at the head of 3,000 of his troops, commanded by Burgoyne, to ascertain and capture that stronghold, of which he has recently been made chief.

A British force under Gen'l Col. Hough—consisting of 150 of the 6th, and the same number of Balaclava, with four howitzers and the required artillery, left Shanghai on the 30th ult., for the purpose of reconnoitring about the vicinity of Keding.

The intelligence from Peking comes down to the 18th inst. The only political news refers to the funeral of that perturbed monarch.

—

Gov. Curtis on Arbitrary Arrests.

We have received Gov. Curtis's special message to the Pennsylvania Legislature on the subject of military arrests by the General Government. He recites the circumstances which led to them, and says that the State Executive has no authority to interfere. Citizens of Pennsylvania are also citizens of the United States, and subject to the authority of the latter. Their remedy for wrongs, if any are suffered, should be supplied by the Judiciary. Executive action would be at this crisis dangerous and revolutionary. If I hoped there would be no further occasion for public trials, we would be relieved of the burden of the law.

the General Government to exercise its power of arrest, but there are still traitors who need to be checked in their diabolical course. Legislation by Congress is required on this subject, and it is for that body to say whether, among other things, a suspension of the writ of habeas corpus is necessary.

The passage of a joint resolution is recommended, earnestly requesting Congress forthwith to enact laws defining and punishing offenses of the kind above referred to, and providing for a trial by jury of persons charged with offenses in the loyal States.

THE ILLINOIS COFFEEHEAD LEGISLATURE RAMPANT.

They Call Upon Friends for Help.

SPRINGFIELD, Friday, Feb. 13, 1863.

Resolutions passed the House to-day, that the Canal bill had been defeated in Congress, the Governor be authorized to appoint commissioners to visit the Parliament of Canada, to apply for improvement of transportation to the Atlantic.

Rested to Command.

BALTIMORE, Friday, Feb. 13, 1863.

Col. Samuel Graham of the 5th New-York Artillery, who was Court-Martialed and displaced, has been restored to his command by the President of the United States.

Great Fire in Norfolk, Va.

FORTRESS MONROE, Thursday, Feb. 12, 1863.

This morning, at 2 o'clock, a fire broke out in the China store of E. M. Kerr, in Newton's block, corner of Main street and Market Square, and consumed about ten buildings. The following firms were burnt out: E. M. Kerr, crockery, china, and glass; Baker's Shouting Gallery; King (formerly G. W. Parrott), merchant tailor (large stock of goods); F. W. Clark, druggist; Hoffheimer, clothing; John Peters, druggist; E. P. Tabb & Co., hardware; S. F. Owen & Co., dry goods; J. D. Reed, hatter; all a total loss, and J. T. Griffin, shoe store (badly damaged); Lubin & Stiner's shoe store (badly damaged by water and moving of goods). The damage is roughly estimated at from \$150,000 to \$200,000 on the buildings and stock. There is some insurance on the property. The particulars of the insurance are not ascertained. The fire is supposed to have been the work of an incendiary.

The *Norfolk Day Book* publishes to-day the life of Brig.-Gen. Viele, Military Governor of Norfolk and Virginia, and the names of the Regiments which voted him into the Democratic nomination.

It is said that the *Piney Woods* elect all but Superintendents, and the *Confederate* elect one Superintendent.

Montgomery—Amsterdam, John McDonald; Charlton, Wm. N. Parsons; Green, Frederick Whipple; Republican Union, S. Campfield; Edmund Bodie; Francis J. Van Venet; Moats, Jacob A. Fonda; Minford, Henry Adams; Moore, John; Muller, Peter; Read, W. H. Dickey; St. George, George Timmerman; Democratic, T. S. Smith, Samuel H. Wood, Demarest, L. C. Some result last evening.

St. Lawrence (as far as heard from)—Caston, M. D. Packard; Miller, A. M. Martin, no rep.; Packard, A. Union, John; Morrison, H. H. Lee, no rep.; Republican, George W. J. Avery, 70—Democrat.

St. Lawrence (as far as heard from)—Caston, M. D. Packard; Miller, A. M. Martin, no rep.; Packard, A. Union, John; Morrison, H. H. Lee, no rep.; Republican, George W. J. Avery, 70—Democrat.

St. Lawrence (as far as heard from)—Caston, M. D. Packard; Miller, A. M. Martin, no rep.; Packard, A. Union, John; Morrison, H. H. Lee, no rep.; Republican, George W. J. Avery, 70—Democrat.

St. Lawrence (as far as heard from)—Caston, M. D. Packard; Miller, A. M. Martin, no rep.; Packard, A. Union, John; Morrison, H. H. Lee, no rep.; Republican, George W. J. Avery, 70—Democrat.

St. Lawrence (as far as heard from)—Caston, M. D. Packard; Miller, A. M. Martin, no rep.; Packard, A. Union, John; Morrison, H. H. Lee, no rep.; Republican, George W. J. Avery, 70—Democrat.

St. Lawrence (as far as heard from)—Caston, M. D. Packard; Miller, A. M. Martin, no rep.; Packard, A. Union, John; Morrison, H. H. Lee, no rep.; Republican, George W. J. Avery, 70—Democrat.

St. Lawrence (as far as heard from)—Caston, M. D. Packard; Miller, A. M. Martin, no rep.; Packard, A. Union, John; Morrison, H. H. Lee, no rep.; Republican, George W. J. Avery, 70—Democrat.

St. Lawrence (as far as heard from)—Caston, M. D. Packard; Miller, A. M. Martin, no rep.; Packard, A. Union, John; Morrison, H. H. Lee, no rep.; Republican, George W. J. Avery, 70—Democrat.

St. Lawrence (as far as heard from)—Caston, M. D. Packard; Miller, A. M. Martin, no rep.; Packard, A. Union, John; Morrison, H. H. Lee, no rep.; Republican, George W. J. Avery, 70—Democrat.

St. Lawrence (as far as heard from)—Caston, M. D. Packard; Miller, A. M. Martin, no rep.; Packard, A. Union, John; Morrison, H. H. Lee, no rep.; Republican, George W. J. Avery, 70—Democrat.

St. Lawrence (as far as heard from)—Caston, M. D. Packard; Miller, A. M. Martin, no rep.; Packard, A. Union, John; Morrison, H. H. Lee, no rep.; Republican, George W. J. Avery, 70—Democrat.

St. Lawrence (as far as heard from)—Caston, M. D. Packard; Miller, A. M. Martin, no rep.; Packard, A. Union, John; Morrison, H. H. Lee, no rep.; Republican, George W. J. Avery, 70—Democrat.

St. Lawrence (as far as heard from)—Caston, M. D. Packard; Miller, A. M. Martin, no rep.; Packard, A. Union, John; Morrison, H. H. Lee, no rep.; Republican, George W. J. Avery, 70—Democrat.

St. Lawrence (as far as heard from)—Caston, M. D. Packard; Miller, A. M. Martin, no rep.; Packard, A. Union, John; Morrison, H. H. Lee, no rep.; Republican, George W. J. Avery, 70—Democrat.

St. Lawrence (as far as heard from)—Caston, M. D. Packard; Miller, A. M. Martin, no rep.; Packard, A. Union, John; Morrison, H. H. Lee, no rep.; Republican, George W. J. Avery, 70—Democrat.

St. Lawrence (as far as heard from)—Caston, M. D. Packard; Miller, A. M. Martin, no rep.; Packard, A. Union, John; Morrison, H. H. Lee, no rep.; Republican, George W. J. Avery, 70—Democrat.

St. Lawrence (as far as heard from)—Caston, M. D. Packard; Miller, A. M. Martin, no rep.; Packard, A. Union, John; Morrison, H. H. Lee, no rep.; Republican, George W. J. Avery, 70—Democrat.

St. Lawrence (as far as heard from)—Caston, M. D. Packard; Miller, A. M. Martin, no rep.; Packard, A. Union, John; Morrison, H. H. Lee, no rep.; Republican, George W. J. Avery, 70—Democrat.

St. Lawrence (as far as heard from)—Caston, M. D. Packard; Miller, A. M. Martin, no rep.; Packard, A. Union, John; Morrison, H. H. Lee, no rep.; Republican, George W. J. Avery, 70—Democrat.

St. Lawrence (as far as heard from)—Caston, M. D. Packard; Miller, A. M. Martin, no rep.; Packard, A. Union, John; Morrison, H. H. Lee, no rep.; Republican, George W. J. Avery, 70—Democrat.

St. Lawrence (as far as heard from)—Caston, M. D. Packard; Miller, A. M. Martin, no rep.; Packard, A. Union, John; Morrison, H. H. Lee, no rep.; Republican, George W. J. Avery, 70—Democrat.

St. Lawrence (as far as heard from)—Caston, M. D. Packard; Miller, A. M. Martin, no rep.; Packard, A. Union, John; Morrison